



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,625	03/21/2007	Derek O'Hagan	PP020407.0004	7269
27476	7590	04/06/2009	EXAMINER	
NOVARTIS VACCINES AND DIAGNOSTICS INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY R338 P.O. BOX 8097 Emeryville, CA 94662-8097			LUCAS, ZACHARIAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/554,625	O'HAGAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Zachariah Lucas	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Notice to Comply</u> .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

### *Specification*

2. The specification is objected to for containing referring to sequences without also identifying them by the sequence identifier assigned to them in the sequence listing as required by 37 CFR 1.821(d). See, Figure 2, and page 28 lines 18-19. The examiner would like to bring the applicant's attention to the following excerpt from MPEP §2422.03:

37 CFR 1.821(d) requires the use of the assigned sequence identifier in all instances where the description or claims of a patent application discuss sequences regardless of whether a given sequence is also embedded in the text of the description or claims of an application. This requirement is also intended to permit references, in both the description and claims, to sequences set forth in the "Sequence Listing" by the use of assigned sequence identifiers without repeating the sequence in the text of the description or claims. Sequence identifiers can also be used to discuss and/or claim parts or fragments of a properly presented sequence. For example, language such as "residues 14 to 243 of SEQ ID NO: 23" is permissible and the fragment need not be separately presented in the "Sequence Listing." Where a sequence is embedded in the text of an application, it must be presented in a manner that complies with the requirements of the sequence rules.

The applicant is therefore required to amend the specification to comply with 37 CFR 1.821(d).

### **REQUIREMENT FOR UNITY OF INVENTION**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(a), a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in a national stage application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim. See 37 CFR 1.475(e).

#### **When Claims Are Directed to Multiple Categories of Inventions:**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(b), a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or

(5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

Otherwise, unity of invention might not be present. See 37 CFR 1.475(c).

3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-27 and 29, drawn to a composition comprising a polynucleotide encoding an HCV E1E2 complex adsorbed to a cationic microparticle, and a first method of use.

Group II, claim(s) 28, drawn to methods for making the indicated compositions.

4. The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the common technical feature of these inventions is the presence or use of a composition comprising a cationic microparticle with a nucleic acid encoding an HCV E1E2 complex adsorbed thereto. Such a composition is disclosed in the prior art. See e.g., WO 01/47551, pages 39-40. Further, the reference suggests the use of polynucleotides encoding residues 192-804 of the HCV polyprotein (page 2, lines 26-27), including that of Choo et al., PNAS 88:2451-55 (pages 15-16, wherein these residues share at least 80% identity to the sequence of Figure 2). The claims therefore lack a special technical feature over the teachings of the prior art, and therefore lack unity.

***Species Election***

Art Unit: 1648

5. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

For Group I above, the Applicant is required to elect

- one of the polymers identified in claims 3 or 9.

Further, if a poly( $\alpha$ -hydroxy acid) is elected, Applicant is further required to elect one of the subspecies thereof identified in claims 4 or 10 (with claims 5, 6, 11, 22-27, and 29 drawn specifically to the subspecies comprising poly(D,L-lactide-co-glycolide)).

- an embodiment wherein the second administered composition comprises an adjuvant selected from  
(a) an oil-in-water emulsion (claims 17-20, 23-26),  
(b) a CpG oligonucleotide (claim 21), or  
(c) both (claim 27).

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species as listed above.

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 12-16, and 28.

6. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the same reasons as indicated with respect to the inventive Groups above, and because the various adjuvants identified by these claims do not share a common special technical feature over the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of

the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachariah Lucas whose telephone number is (571)272-0905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary B. Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Zachariah Lucas/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1648

Art Unit: 1648

**NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS  
CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE  
DISCLOSURES**

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 CAR §1.821 - §1.825 for the following reason(s):

[X] 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CAR §1.821 - §1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990, and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.

[X] 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 CAR §1.821(c).

[X] 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 CAR §1.821(e).

[ ] 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 CAR §1.822 and/or §1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the "Validation Report."

[ ] 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached "Validation Report." A substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 CAR §1.825(d).

[ ] 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 CAR §1.821(e).

[ ] 7. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE:**

[X] An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing."

[X] An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing," as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.

[X] A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 CAR §1.821(e) or §1.821(f) or §1.821(g) or §1.825(b) or §1.825(d).

**FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH THESE REQUIREMENTS, PLEASE  
CONTACT:**

For Rules Interpretation, call (571)272-0951

For Patentin Software help, call (866)217-9197 or (703)-305-3028/308-6845

**PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE.**